

Notice of Allowability

Application No.

09/937,796

Examiner

Arnel C. Lavarias

Applicant(s)

KODEN ET AL.

Art Unit

2872

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. ☒ This communication is responsive to 7/15/05, 5/13/05.
2. ☒ The allowed claim(s) is/are 1-40.
3. ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of the:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* Certified copies not received: _____.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.

THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.

4. ☐ A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.
5. ☐ CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.
 - (a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached
 - 1) ☐ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No./Mail Date _____.
 - (b) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date _____.Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).
6. ☐ DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

Attachment(s)

1. ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2. ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3. ☐ Information Disclosure Statements (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08), Paper No./Mail Date _____
4. ☐ Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit of Biological Material
5. ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6. ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413), Paper No./Mail Date 9/23/05.
7. ☒ Examiner's Amendment/Comment
8. ☒ Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance
9. ☐ Other _____

THONG NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 2800

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/15/05 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

2. The amendments to Claims 1-2, 5-20, 26-35, 38-40 in the submission dated 7/15/05 are acknowledged and accepted. In view of these amendments, the rejections in Section 8 of the Office Action dated 4/25/05 are respectfully withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

3. The Applicants' arguments, see in particular Pages 13-19 of the submission, filed 7/15/05, with respect to the rejections of Claims 1-40, have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejections of Claims 1-40 in Sections 10-17 of the Office Action dated 7/15/05 have been withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 1-40 are allowed.

EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

5. An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with George W. Hartnell, III (617-517-5523) on 9/23/05.

The application has been amended as follows:

Page 13, delete the following paragraph at lines 7-10, "Figure 14 is a cross-sectional view showing composite stacking of a liquid crystal display element section and an organic EL display element section a conventional composite element-type display."

REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

6. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Claim 1 is allowable over the cited art of record for at least the reason that the cited art of record fails to teach or reasonably suggest an optical control device that does not use a color filter, as generally set forth in Claim 1, the device including, in combination with the features recited in Claim 1, the first substrate having a plurality of light output layers,

each of the plurality of light output layers corresponding to only one of the first electrodes, wherein all of the plurality of light output layers shine when a specified time has elapsed such that the liquid crystal between each of the first and second substrates is able to respond to the scan signals and signal voltages to modulate light intensity transmitted therethrough to a desired display intensity after a complete set of data signals for each scan line is transmitted to the first electrodes and extinguishes before a succeeding complete set of data signals for each scan line is transmitted. Claims 5, 7, 9-10, 21, 26, 31, and 36 are dependent on Claim 1, and hence are allowable for at least the same reasons Claim 1 is allowable.

Claim 2 is allowable over the cited art of record for at least the reason that the cited art of record fails to teach or reasonably suggest an optical control device that does not use a color filter, as generally set forth in Claim 2, the device including, in combination with the features recited in Claim 2, the first substrate having a plurality of light output layers, each of the plurality of light output layers corresponding to only one of the gate electrodes, wherein all of the plurality of light output layers shine when a specified time has elapsed such that the liquid crystal between each of the first and second substrates is able to respond to the scan signals and signal voltages to modulate light intensity transmitted therethrough to a desired display intensity after a complete set of data signals for each scan line is transmitted to the gate electrodes and extinguishes before a succeeding complete set of data signals for each scan line is transmitted. Claims 3-4, 6, 8, 16-20, 22, 27, 32, and 37 are dependent on Claim 2, and hence are allowable for at least the same reasons Claim 2 is allowable.

Claims 11 and 13 are allowable over the cited art of record for at least the reason that the cited art of record fails to teach or reasonably suggest an optical control device-driving method, as generally set forth in Claims 11 and 13, the method including, in combination with the features recited in Claims 11 and 13, the first substrate having a plurality of light output layers, each of the plurality of light output layers corresponding to only one of the first electrodes; shining all of the plurality of light output layers when a specified time has elapsed such that the liquid crystal between each of the first and second substrates is able to respond to the scan signals and signal voltages to modulate light intensity transmitted therethrough to a desired display intensity after a complete set of data signals for each scan line is transmitted to the first electrodes; and extinguishing all of the plurality of light output layers before a succeeding complete set of data signals for each scan line is transmitted. Claims 12, 23-24, 28-29, 33-34, and 38-39 are dependent on Claims 11 and 13, and hence are allowable for at least the same reasons Claims 11 and 13 are allowable.

Claim 14 is allowable over the cited art of record for at least the reason that the cited art of record fails to teach or reasonably suggest an optical control device-driving method, as generally set forth in Claim 14, the method including, in combination with the features recited in Claim 14, the first substrate having a plurality of light output layers, each of the plurality of light output layers corresponding to only one of the electrodes that apply scan signals to the liquid crystal; shining all of the plurality of light output layers when a specified time has elapsed such that the liquid crystal between each of the first and second substrates is able to respond to the scan signals and signal voltages to

Art Unit: 2872

modulate light intensity transmitted therethrough to a desired display intensity after a complete set of data signals for each scan line is transmitted to scan lines; and extinguishing all of the plurality of light out layers before a succeeding complete set of data signals for each scan line is transmitted. Claims 15, 25, 30, 35, and 40 are dependent on Claim 14, and hence are allowable for at least the same reasons Claim 1 is allowable.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arnel C. Lavarias whose telephone number is 571-272-2315. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30 AM - 6 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Drew Dunn can be reached on 571-272-2312. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2872

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Arnel C. Lavarias
9/23/05



THONG NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 2800